providing the client with a non-volatile store of complex images, each of said complex images having an identity;

selecting at least one image from the stored images;

transmitting the identity of the or each selected image from said client to said remote server; and

determining, in said remote server, from the identity of the or each image selected, whether the client is authorised to gain access, via the server, to the network resource.

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 14 are independent.

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,608,387 to Davies in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,317,544 to Diehl. Davies was cited by the Applicant.

The Examiner believes that Davies shows all that is claimed except for "a distributed client/server". Diehl is cited as teaching a distributed client/server. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of these two references "to improve the capability of [the] system."

On October 3, 2002, the undersigned spoke by telephone with the Examiner and explained the invention to the Examiner. In particular, it was explained that the complex images of the present invention are stored on the client computer rather than the server computer as shown in Davies. It was further explained that this provided the advantage of conserving bandwidth since the images do not need to be transmitted from the server to the client as in Davies.

After carefully reviewing the Davies reference with the Examiner on the telephone, it was agreed that Davies did not teach storing images on the client computer and that the only indication of where the images were stored was on the server computer as shown in Figure 1 by the arrow leading from a source of images 1 to the server computer 10 and the server side storage 18. Although Davies may be ambiguous in some places as to where the images are stored, the only places where it is specific it shows the images stored in the server.

Although the present invention is claimed in the context of a client and a server, it should be appreciated that the same advantages could be achieved in other computing systems provided that the complex images are <u>not transmitted</u> from one computer to another. The key to the present invention is that the images are stored in the same computer where they will be selected and that

once an image is selected, only an identification of the image is transmitted to the other computer. This is clearly set forth in independent claims 1 and 14 and the Examiner has not taken the position that these claims do not say this.

The Examiner has maintained that Davies teaches transmitting the identity of an image from the same computer where the images are stored to another computer. The so-called "identity statement" in Davies is always transmitted to the computer where the images are stored. In the present invention, the identity of the images is always transmitted from the computer where the images are stored.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner hinted at how she was interpreting the prior art to teach storing an image at the computer which received it. Although not explicitly stated by the Examiner, it appears that she is of the opinion that in order to display an image on a computer, it must be "stored" there in some form, such as in video RAM. For this reason, the claims have been amended to require that the images be stored at the client in a non-volatile memory. It is clear from the specification that it is intended that the images be stored in non-volatile memory on the client computer so that they do not need to be transmitted from the server to the client. See, e.g., page 5, lines 9 et seq.

It is believed that the Examiner understands the differences between the invention and the prior art and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner work with the Applicant to arrive at mutually agreeable claim language if the present amendment is not satisfactory.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas A. Gallagher
Reg. No. 31,358
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.
65 Woods End Road
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-1160

November 4, 2002

1. (twice amended) A distributed client/server computer network, said network comprising:

a client and a remote server;

non-volatile means in said client for storing a plurality of complex images, each of said complex images having an identity;

means for selecting at least one complex image from said plurality of complex images stored by said client;

means for transmitting the identity of said selected complex image or images from client to said remote server; and

means for determining by said remote server, from the identity of the or each image selected, whether the client is authorised to gain access, via the remote server, to a network resource.

14. (twice amended) A method for providing a client of a distributed client/server computer network with controlled access, via a remote server, to a network resource, said method comprising the steps of:

providing the client with a non-volatile store of complex images, each of said complex images having an identity;

selecting at least one image from the stored images;

transmitting the identity of the or each selected image from said client to said remote server; and

determining, in said remote server, from the identity of the or each image selected, whether the client is authorised to gain access, via the server, to the network resource.